

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 10217-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/707,608

### REMARKS

#### Present Status of the Application

The Office Action has rejected all pending claims 12-17 and 21-24. After carefully considering the rejection reasons set forth in this Office Action and the cited reference, Applicant has amended claims 12 and 21 to more clearly describe the claimed invention. Additionally, Applicant has amended claims 23-24 to improve clarity. Applicant respectfully submits that the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection are respectfully requested.


#### Discussion of Office Action Rejections under 35 U.S.C 102(e)

*The Office Action has rejected claims 12-17 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as being anticipated by Asano et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0190924 A1). In response thereto, Applicant hereby otherwise disagrees and traverses the above rejections as follows. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12-17 and 21-22 patently define over Asano, and thus should be allowed.*

In the attached drawing modified by Applicant (shown in next page), Applicant submits that the common power line (14) disclosed by *Asano* is coupled to a line voltage of  $V_0$ , a plurality of power line A1 and B1 are electrically connected with the common power line (14). In the attached drawing modified by Applicant (shown in next page), a plurality of power lines A2 are electrically connected between the power line A1 and

Customer No.: 31561  
 Docket No.: 10217-US-PA  
 Application No.: 10/707,608

the organic EL device (ELi), and a plurality of power lines B2 are electrically connected between the power line B1 and the organic EL device (ELi). Obviously, the power lines A2 and B2 disclosed by *Asano* are not equivalent with the first internal power lines and the second internal power lines as recited in claims 12 because each of the power lines A2 and B2 disclosed by *Asano* does not directly connected to at least two of the pixels. As shown in the attached drawing modified by Applicant, each power line A2 or each power line B2 is directly connected to only one pixel.



ATTACHED DRAWING MODIFIED BY APPLICANT

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 10217-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/707,608

Additionally, the power lines A2 and B2 disclosed by *Asano* are not equivalent with the first internal power lines and the second internal power lines as recited in claims 21 because each of the power lines A2 and B2 disclosed by *Asano* does not directly connected to the pixels in the same column or in the same row. As shown in the attached drawing modified by Applicant, each power line A2 or each power line B2 is directly connected to only one pixel.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claims 12 and 21 patently define over *Asano* and should be allowed. Further, since claims 13-17 and 22 are dependent claims which further define the invention recited in claims 12 and 21, as a matter of law, these dependent claims are also in condition for allowance. *In re Fine*, 837, F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectively requested.

**Discussion of the claim rejection under 35 USC 103(a)**

*The Office Action has rejected claims 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Asano et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0190924 A1). In response thereto, Applicant hereby otherwise disagrees and traverses the above rejections as follows.*

For at least the foregoing reasons listed in the discussion of the 35 U.S.C Section 102 rejections above, independent claims 12 and 21 are not anticipated by *Asano*. Applicant believes that the foregoing discussion places the dependent claims in condition for reconsideration. Since claims 23 and 24 are dependent claims which further define

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 10217-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/707,608

the invention cited in claims 12 and 21, they are allowable as a matter of law, because these dependent claims contain all features of their respective independent claims 12 and 21. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Additionally, Applicant submits that *Asano* fails to disclose the limitation "... the first external power line and the second external power line are respectively disposed at two opposite sides of the whole pixel array..." and the first internal power lines and the second internal power lines do not extend crossing the whole pixel array" recited in claims 23-24. Since such arrangement of the first external power line and the second external power line recited in claims 23-24 is NOT disclosed by *Asano*, Applicant submits that one ordinary skilled in the art would not modify the position of the power lines A1 and B1 without further teaching, suggestion, or motivation. Specifically, the power lines A1 and B1 are distributed within the pixel array, instead, the first external power line and the second external power line recited in claims 12 and 21 are respectively disposed at two opposite sides of the whole pixel array. If one ordinary skilled in the art wants to modify the position of the power lines A1 and B1, the concept of circuit design disclosed by *Asano* is entirely destructed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectively requested.

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 10217-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/707,608

### CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

Dec. 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee  
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor-1, No. 100  
Roosevelt Road, Section 2  
Taipei, 100  
Taiwan  
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800  
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233  
Email: [Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw](mailto:Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw)